

REMARKS

The Office Action of February 17, 2010, was received and carefully reviewed. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, and 5 are amended, and new claims 23-34 are added. New independent claims 27 and 31 recite the feature, “wherein a contact angle of the first region to the composition containing the pattern formation material is larger than the contact angle of the second region to the composition containing the pattern formation material by 30° or more”. Support for these claims can be found in, for example, paragraph [0083] of the Application Publication. Support for new dependent claims 23-26, 29, 30, 33 and 34 can be found in, for example, paragraph [0087] of the Application Publication. Support for new dependent claims 28 and 32 can be found in, for example, paragraph [0098] of the Application Publication. Claims 3, 4, and 6-22 have been previously withdrawn from consideration. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 5 and 23-34 are currently pending for consideration.

In addition, corrections have been made in the specification to correct an inadvertent omission. This amendment should be considered acceptable because no new matter has been added. It is readily apparent from the specification and the drawings that the word was omitted by mistake, and that it is supported by the disclosure as filed. Support may be found, for example, on page 19, lines 13-18, and page 21, lines 3-9.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sadao (JP 11-207959). In response to this rejection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 2 to add the feature, “to form a conductive layer”, which is supported by paragraph [0078] of the Application Publication. Paragraph [0015] of Sadao teaches, “[h]ere, the fluent material means not only an ink but also a media which has a viscosity capable of being discharged from a nozzle to be used for industrial. Water-based or oil-based is not concerned. Further, the fluent may include mixture in colloidal.” However, Sadao is silent about a conductive layer, as is recited in amended claims 1 and 2. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sadao in view of Maikner (US 2002/0017149). However, Applicant submits that Sadao and Maikner are in completely different fields of endeavor and are in non-analogous arts; therefore, there would be no motivation to combine the references in order to come to the present invention. In other words, one skilled in the art would not look to a method of measuring the chromatographic properties of hydrophobic polymer substrates, such as that disclosed in Maikner, in order to form a pattern on a substrate wherein a first region is formed by forming a substance having a fluorocarbon chain. According to MPEP 2143.01, “[t]he test for obviousness is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art, and all teachings in the prior art must be considered to the extent that they are in analogous arts” (emphasis added). Thus, it would not have been obvious to incorporate Maikner into Sadao. Furthermore, Maikner fails to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Sadao with respect to amended claims 1 and 2, upon which claim 5 depends.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant contends that claims 1, 2 and 5, as well as new claims 23-34, are allowable. If the Examiner believes a conference would be helpful in expediting prosecution of the instant application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

/Jeffrey L. Costellia, Reg. No. 35,483/
Jeffrey L. Costellia
Registration No. 35,483

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000

Fax: 202-585-8080